

JERUB-BAAL.

BEING,

A Three-penny Answer

TO A

Twelve-Penny Book.

Written by *William Affbeton*, D. D.
and *Rector of Beckenham in Kent*.

Which he is pleased to Stile a
Conference with an

ANABAPTIST.

In which Answer you have his *Presumpti-
ions* proved to be no *Proofs* for

INFANT-BAPTISM.

By *E. P.* A Preacher of the Gospel.

*Judges 6. 32. Let Baal plead against him, be-
cause one hath thrown down his Altar.*

*The Baptism of John, whence was it, from
Heaven or of Men? Mat. 21. 25.*

I beseech you regard not what this or that Man saith, but en-
quire allthings of the Scriptures, saith, *Crys. Hom. on 2. Cor.*

LONDON: Printed for the **AUTHOR**, and
Sold by *B. Harris*, at the upper-end of *Grace-
church-street*, next *Corn-hill*. & 697.

To the Impartial READER.

M*Y* Freinds and Country-men what was of old Pre-
dicted by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, is ma-
nifested in these our days, 2Tim. 4. 4. That, men shall
turn away their ears from the truth, and will be tur-
ned unto Fables. Amongst which, there is not a great-
er shrouded under the notion of Religious worship: then
that which most men will call Infant-baptism; tho' it
hath not so much as the likeness of Christ's baptism. 1.
Not the Subjects; for they are no other then penitent
Believers; 2. Not the Sign; for that is total Immersion,
Burying, or overwhelming in Water. 3. Not the thing
Signified; which is a Death to Sin; being buried with
Christ, Rising again to Newness of Life: None of all
this is in Infants-baptism. Reader, thou art here Pre-
sented with a Brief Reply to a Book written by a Worthy
Dr. a Gentleman of parts and learning its pity he dropt
upon such an undertaking that hath been so very un-
fortunate to all the managers of it that it never Gained
them Credit; I Expected that some of our more able
& Learned Guides: (the strings of whose Books, with
Respect to Parts, and Learning, I am not worthy to un-
ty, would in a few lines have dispatcht an answer: but
it not appearing; and the Dr in his Preface so earnest-
ly Inviting to the work; put me upon the Attempt;
And I hope my zeal for every gospel truth was the chief
motive, together with the good of Souls. Was God so
Jealous of his own worship that he severly punished the
Violators of it, what will become of them that obey not
the Gospel of God? if the conquest of an enemy against
the command of his general, cost a Roman Gentleman
his life, Chryl. in Rom. 1. Hom. 2. And the killing of a
Lyon contrary to the law of the Kings hunting, cost a poor
Persian his head: O then do not presume on the violati-
on of Gods laws: And now that God would direct and
Establish you in in all Gospel truths is the Prayer of thy

Some brief Reflections on the *Doctor's* Preface.

IN Pag. 1. He expresseth the deep Sense he hath of the great Duty that lyes upon him, to Convince some Baptists in his Parish, of the Error of their not Baptising their Infants: For which neglect of theirs, he demands their Reason, &c. Upon which his Neighbour *B. A.* sends the Dr. a few Lines including this one Reason; Because Christ, the great Lawgiver to the Gospel-Church, never Commanded us to Baptise them, &c. which is worded at large in the Dr's Preface; p. 2, 3, 4, 5. To which Letter, the Dr. returns a very Friendly and smooth Answer; and subscribes himself, His affectionate Pastor, &c. p. 6, 7. And then he tells us; 'He procured the Writings of our most Eminent Authors, that he may inform himself of the Controversies. — And yet, after all, he solemnly Declares, 'That he is more Confirmed, that the Baptism of young Children is in any wise to be Retained in the Church, as most agreeable to the Institution of Christ, &c.

Reply. First, Sir, How should it become a Controversie? I confess there are some Differences in Religion; that there are some show of Reason to be Controverted: What, a Controversie, and yet such an Agreement! For, (1st.) Do not we agree, That the holy Scriptures are the only Rule of Faith, in Religious Worship. (2.) You, and we, and all, except Quakers, or Papists, say, That what is not to be found in Scripture, is no part of Divine Worship. (3) Both we and you agree, that there is no Precept, nor Example for Infant-baptism in all the Scriptures. (4.) And, Sir; Do not we all agree, That there is both Precept and Example in Scripture for Believer's Baptism. Now what great Reason is there for this?

infants-baptism should be laid aside? And what little Reason is there it should be a Controversie any longer. And yet the Dr. saith, for all this, That Baptizing of young Children must be retained in the Church; with a Pretence too, of being most agreeable to Christ's Institution: O dreadful! when the contrary is so evident: But it's too Desperate an Attacque, to talk of laying that aside, which was the Basis on which the Antichristian Monarchy was Founded; from the Pinnacle of whose proud Superstructure, the Man of Sin did cast his Imperial Glance, and say with *Nebuchadnezzar*; *Vah, Babylon, Babylon, Proprio te robore Servo.*

Preface. p. 8. The Dr. saith, 'He hath not been afraid of Objections, but hath given them their full Weight.

Reply. I know no Objection he hath answered, as the Reader will observe, And I do not see he feared them, for he hath leapt over them as so many Straws. Yet p. 9. He hopes he hath competently proved that Infants, as well as adult persons, ought to be Baptised &c. Then Sir, it seems adult persons ought to be Baptised; but how hath he proved that Infants are?

'And the Second Part, the Dr. saith, shall be another distinct Treatise; that he will Publish in due time; to convince us that it is not necessary to Administer Baptizing by *Dipping*——Which is all one as if he had said, it is not necessary to Administer Baptizing by *Baptizing*; for he knows *Dipping* is *Baptizing*: And it cannot be without *Dipping Mergo Immergo, Obbruo, Item, Tingo, &c.* to *Dip, Plunge, &c.* what wonders the Dr. will do I know not: He Talks great, and promises to resolve all our Scruples, and Doubts: Which we wait for.

JERUB-BAAL.

BEING,

A Three-penny Answer

TO

Dr. ASHTON'S Conference, &c.

Page 2. **T**HE Doctor desires to know
the Reason why we refuse
to baptize our Infants.

Answer. Because Christ, the great Law-
giver to the Gospel-Church, hath not Com-
manded it, and we dare not change, or alter
the Sacraments and Subjects of the New-
Testament. — Therefore we count it no
Neglect to omit that which never was in-
joyned as the Duty of Christians to Per-
form.

Dr. p. 3. ' This then is your Reason ?

B

Repln.

Reply. This is one, and a good one too: For to practice that under the notion of a Gospel-Ordinance, without a Gospel-Command, is daring Presumption: for it cannot be Childrens right in Infancy, there being no Command, or Authority for it in the Gospel; which were the *Dr.* capable of assigning such Authority, I should not so much admire his great Confidence: But there is no reason that we should accept of such frivolous Stuff, or inconsequent Non-sequiters as are commonly brought; *That Infants were Circumcised, therefore to be Baptised. Infants were in Covenant, and Holy, and capable of Salvation, and therefore to be Baptised.* This is but a pittiful begging the Question, so to Argue.

Dr. p. 5. ‘But will you then submit, ‘acknowledge your Error, and baptise ‘your Children?’

Reply. Yes, we will when the *Dr.* hath proved it our Duty by divine Authority: I do hereby faithfully promise him in behalf of the rest, I will become their Surety or Sponser for it: for I hope we are Conscionably tender of all known Duties.

Dr. ‘I am afraid you will not; for some mens Prejudices are so strong, they will

‘no

‘not submit to the plainest Conviction :
 ‘And therefore it is but trifling to call for
 ‘Gospel-commands, when your Prejudices,
 ‘or Fancies will not suffer you to observe
 ‘them ; — as I could more particularly con-
 ‘vince you, if the Digression were not too
 ‘large ; in the neglecting the use of the
 ‘*Lord’s-Prayer*, and Singing of *Psalms*, both
 ‘which are commanded in the Gospel of
 ‘our Lord Jesus.

Reply. How now, Sir? What, are all
 your smooth words spent already? —
 What, are we judged Prejudiced Persons,
 and neglecters of Gospel Commands, all
 in a Breath, without the least Provocation?
 What, will not our Prejudices or Fancies
 admit us to imbrace Truth? I fear you
 judge us out of a principle of your own
 Brest! --- Sure, our *Rector’s* Intellects are
 not so clear, nor his Brains so well clarify’d,
 as to inspect our Hearts, and know us better
 than we ourselves: Prejudices strong! Pre-
 judices and Fancies! — Because we cannot
 subscribe to his bare *Ipse-dixits*; nor take
 his *Say so’s*, for *Proofs*. --- Can the Dr.
 suppose that such disingenious Insinuations
 will credit his Cause? Moreover, it’s an
 unjust Charge, to accuse us with neglect

of the *Lord's-Prayer*, and Singing *Psalms*; for we are in the practice of them both, as they are enjoined in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus. Now, how unfit our *Rector* is to be a *Corrector* of his dissenting Parishoners, let the Reader judge?

The Dr. spends the six and seventh pages about the Command we expect of him: He asks, 'Whether it's *totidem verbis* we expect? An *express* Command, which is necessary in all positive Worship, such as the Sacrament of *Baptism* is, which depends upon the Will of the great Legislator.

In p. 8. The Dr. is pleased to say, 'It 'is unreasonable (not to say impertinent) 'for us to require an *express* Command for '*Infants-baptism*. This he hopes to convince us of.

Reply. I ask the Dr. What Ordinance there is, that hath it's Sanction from divine Authority, that is not expressly commanded under either *Law* or *Gospel*? *Circumcision*, Gen. 17. 12. Every Man-child on the eighth Day shall be circumcised--- Their passover-Sacrifices, and carnal-Ordinances, Heb. 9. 4, 5.--10. of which we cannot now speak particularly; and God made those the instances of his Justice, that made the least deroga-

derogation therefrom, as may be abundantly shewed. Likewise, the Sacraments of the New-Testament, are expressly Recorded and Injoyed. --- *Baptism*; the Subjects penitent-Believers, Men and Women; *Acts* 8. 12. - 37. *Acts* 10. 48. *Acts* 16. 30. *Acts* 18. 8. Such that had not the prerequisite Qualifications, are repulsed, *Mat.* 3. though the Natural Seed of believing *Abram.* --- And how expressly is the *Lords-Supper* laid down in Scripture, *1 Cor.* 11. 20. with the antecedent Duty of Self-examination: What can be more express?

But the Dr. saith, 'It is unreasonable for us to expect express Command in Scripture for *Infant-baptism*.

Reply. It is so: First, because *Infant-baptism* is a mere human Tradition. And Secondly, because it is contradictory to common Sense and Reason, that *Rantism* should be *Baptism*: and that a Babe should be Regenerated and Born again, at a Day Old, by acting of such a Tragedy.

Dr. p. 8. 'And, first it may a little abate your Confidence, to tell you, (*saith he*) that what you so warmly insist upon, hath ever been the practice of the greatest *Heretics* in all Ages of the Church. Were I

‘ to Discourse with *Scholars*, who are capable to examin antient Writings, I could then shew you that this Appeal to the express words of Scripture, was the very Artifice of the first Four grand *Heresies*, condemned by the first Four general *Councils*.

Reply. If we may not appeal to express Commands in Scripture for Gospel-Ordinances, I wonder for what we may expect express Commands? I am sorry to read such Expressions from so worthy a Protestant *Doctor*. He talks of our Symbolizing with *Hereticks*, — “It is pity he should so Symbolize with Father *Simon* the French Priest, Author of the *Critical History of the Old-Testament*; who makes it his Business to shew the Insufficiency of the Scriptures to decide Controverlies in Religion without Tradition. In his *Preface* he hath these Words, *There is, without doubt, Ignorance, or Prepossession in the minds of Protestants, who pretend that the Scripture is clear of it self, without the help of Tradition.*

Then let me enquire into matter of Fact: And it’s pity the Dr. would not be so kind as to have favoured us with a Citation of those Antient Writings, — But either he was sensible that none of us could examine them, tho’

tho' several of our Authors he mentions in his Book, were no way inferiour to himself in Learning. Or else, 2dly, His Reason why he did not mention them, was because they would do his Cause no kindness : For I am satisfy'd, that the antient and most approved Authors are directly against him. St. *Augustine* is of another mind in his 2d Book of *Christian Doctrin*, cap. 9. *In iis quæ Aperta Scriptura posita, sunt inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi,* — In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture, are found all those things which appertain to Faith, and the Rules of Living. This antient Dr. was not of our Pastors mind : For to be plainly laid down, and expressed, are *Synonymous Terms* ; but *Infant-baptism* is neither expressed, nor plainly laid down in Scripture ; so that it doth not appertain either to Faith or Manners. St. *Epiphanius*, who lived about the end of *Century 4.* who Wrote a Catalogue of all the *Heresies* down to his Day, saith thus in that Catalogue : The Cause of their *Heresies* arises from these *Hereticks* not applying themselves to Scripture, with a Spirit of Piety : For it is a constant Principle, saith he, that all the saving Truths are found

clearly

clearly in the Scripture. Now I conceive, to be found clearly, is expressly; and what can be more express against our Doctor's disingenuous Suggestion, than this antient Author? Again, *Tertullian* before him, in his Dispute against *Hermogenes*, cap. 22. *Adoro Scripturæ, &c. I adore the fulness of Scriptures; let Hermogenes demonstrate that it is Written; if it be not Written, let him fear that Woe which is pronounced against those that add, or lessen it.* And in his Book of the *Flesh of Christ*, disputing with that Heretick *Apelles*,—*Non recipio quod extra Scripturam, &c. I do not allow of what thou sayest or urgest, that is not in Scripture.* I wonder what kindness any antient Authors would do our Doctor's Cause, for behold, they are generally express against him? How doth our Lord declare, that those antient Hereticks, the *Saducees*, did Err, in denying the Resurrection? They did not know the Scriptures: not for appealing to 'um. *Luke 10. 26.* Christ asks the Lawyer, *How readest thou? —*

Again, the Dr. saith, *It was the practice of the greatest Hereticks in all Ages of the Church, to appeal to express Scripture.* — I desire to know, what Church he means? But at present I am under a temptation to believe

believe he means the Church of Rome ;
 ' First, Because the Heresie of the Ne-
 ' storians was, in their *Denying the Blessed*
 ' *Virgin to have been the Mother of God.* p. 9.
 ' And the *Macedonians* said, *It was no where*
 ' *Written, that the Holy-Ghost was God.*—
 What our Doctor's Conceptions are in the
 case, I cannot divine ; but I suppose he doth
 not believe the *Virgin Mary* to have been
 the Mother of the *Holy-Ghost* : I cannot
 find, that in his late Discourse on the *Trinity*,
 he hath such a Conception : Nor do I see
 how it should be believed, that a *Creature*
 should be the Mother of the great CREATOR,
 though She was the Mother of our Lord
 JESUS, according to the *Flesh*. And it's
 most evident, in the Clouds of *Apostacy*,
General Councils did Confirm more *Heresies*
 than they did Condemn ; as Learned *Pa-*
nermitanus saith, " *Magis credendum laico si*
" Scripturas adferat, quam Papa, & tota Con-
" silia, si absque Scripturis agant. i. e. We
 have more reason, to believe a Lay-man,
 if he brings Scripture, than the Pope, and
 the whole Council, if they talk without
 Scripture.-- As indeed they did, when they
 gave *Infants-baptism* it's Sanction in the
Milenetan Council, 402. *It is our Will, that*
 all

[10]
all who affirm young Children have everlasting Life, which are not Baptised to the taking away of Original Sin, shall be Anathematiz'd. So in the 5th Council of Carthage, 416. We Will, that whosoever denyeth, that little Children by Baptism, are not freed from Perdition, and eternally Saved, that they be accursed. This was first Confirmed by Pope Innocent, with Seventy Bishops. Our Will, and We Will, was the Original of Infants-Baptism; not GOD's Will.

And if our Dr. be a Protestant then in the Judgment of such a Church, and General Councils, he is a Heretick also. And as to what the Doctor is pleas'd to say about the London-Conference, Apr. 3d. 1676. I have not perused that, as I can remember, tho' I have read one Dispute betwixt a now Bishop of the Church of Engl. and a Roman Gentleman, which I shall have occasion to mention hereafter. But how consistent the Account the Dr. gives of the Conference he mentions, the Reader may judge, p. 9. 10. of his Book, the *Papists* demanded, 'Where 'the Twenty-Eighth Article of our Church 'was to be read in Scripture, concerning the 'Lord's-Supper, — For as these *Papists* required *express* Scriptures to prove the 'Twenty-

‘ **Twenty-Eighth Article** of our Church, concerning the *Lord's-Supper*, so you, in like manner, demand *express* Scripture for the ‘ **Twenty-Seventh Article**, concerning *Baptism*. And then he thinks, That the practice of these antient *Hereticks*, and modern ‘ *Papists*, should abate our Confidence.

Reply. What, Sir, will you make us believe that your Doctors could not assign an *express* Text of Scripture to prove the *Lord's-Supper*, because you cannot find one to prove *Infant-Sprinkling*? Surely you are mistaken: It must be the Subjects you admit to it, as *Carnal, Unregenerate, Unbaptised Persons*; or your Mode of taking it *Kneeling*, and so *Idolizing* that you know and believe is but *Bread and Wine*, &c. For any Boy would have told them the *Lord's-Supper* is expressly mentioned in 1 Cor. 11. 20. and elsewhere. Now Sir, if this tends no more to abate your Confidence in so bad a Cause, then ours in so Good a one, you may expect more in order to do it hereafter: but let this suffice at present; and know it's not *Heretical* to appeal to *express* Scripture for Confirmation of Gospel-Ordinances.

Dr. p. 12. faith, ‘ We do something in the ‘ **Worship of God** without an *express* Command.

‘mand. Then he tells us, That we are ‘accused to reject the Lord’s Day : Is that so ?

Reply. Surely our affectionate Pastor should know that without taking the place of an Inquisitor ; doth he not *Feed* us on that Day ? — Well, we do as duly observe that Day as himself, from the *Apostles* Example.

The Dr. tells us, p. 13. That there is no Command to keep it in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus. But he asks, Why we do not keep the *Seventh Day Sabbath*.

Reply. Because the great *Law-giver* to the Gospel Church hath not commanded us to keep it : They that were bound to keep the *Seventh day Sabbath*, were by the the same Law-giver bound to reverence the Sanctuary, and keep the *Seventh Year Sabbath*.

Dr. p. 14. Asks, ‘If the Apostles Example is a Rule to us ?

Reply. Yes ; we are obliged to walk as we have them for an Example. What then ?

Then the Dr. casts a Scoff on the *Primitive Christians*, and saith ; *We must turn Levellers, and have all things common.* Acts 2. 44, 45. Acts 4. 32. See here, saith he, a most plain and clear example for Community of Goods. ‘But can you think yourselves ‘obliged

are
hat
for
ace
hat
hat
ble.
is
our
not
he
to
he
ne
ru-
x-
as
n?
ri-
rn
2.
ft
of
es
ed

obliged from this Example of the Apo-
stle's, and primitive Believers, to Sell your
Estates, and distribute them to others, as
every Man hath need, doubtless your
poor Neighbours would be very well con-
tented to Share with you ; but your rich
Landlords, that expect the payment of
your Rents, would not like such Pro-
ceedings.

Reply. Lest the Doctor should be too
fond of this Instance, and magnify his
Mole-hill, to use his own Phrase, I shall,
if possible, put a Check upon his concei-
ted Confidence. I say, it would be ex-
ceeding commendable in the Churches of
Christ on the like occasion, to follow this
Primitive Example.

First, The *Con-Text* shews that they
were Baptised Believers, and intire Lovers
of one another ; for they were of *one*
Heart, and *one Soul*, *Acts*, 2. 41. *Acts*,
4. 32. And,

Secondly ; *Ecclesiastical History* declares,
and so saith many of the *Learned*, That
these Christians at *Jerusalem*, were very
apprehensive of the near approach of a sore
Persecution ; so that they could not say
what they Possessed was their own ; and
therefore

therefore they chose to Sell their Possessions, and make a Common Stock, rather than to be spoiled of their Substance by cruel *Persecutors*: So that now the Poor, that had owned the same *Lord, Faith,* and *Baptism*, may be partakers with them in their *Creature-Comforts*, not as *Levellers*, but as every one had need. — And truly it is not long since the *Baptised Churches* of Christ were in the like State by cruel *Persecutors* here in *England*, that they could not say what they possessed was their own, but their Bodies and Goods were hawled away; to the Renown of our *National Church* be it spoken! But Thanks be to God, & His Majesty K. *WILLIAM*, 'tis otherwise now.

But were our insulting Monitor so well acquainted with Antient Writings as he pretends, he might have found in *Tertul. Apol. cap. 29.* The Christians did so on the like occasion in his Days. And those that have read the Histories of the *United Provinces*, will find that the *Baptised Christians* did so on the like occasion; that they dwelt in *Colleges*, and had a *Stock*, that the Poor might partake of, not as *Levellers*, but as every Man had need. But, alas! our Non-Resident Doctors, with their plurality of

of *Benefits*, cannot endure to hear of such a Doctrin; for then they would for shame part with one to a poor *Curate*: O but this is far from them! for they had rather *In-gross*, and *Monopolize more*; for they have a peculiar Faculty to be more affected with *Sheering* than *Feeding* their Flock. — But I had not thus retorted, but fearing my Antagonist should be Wise in his own Conceit, in producing this Instance to baffle an Example for Gospel-Worship. — p. 15. the Dr. doth Reason Learnedly thus; ‘If all Scripture-Examples do not oblige, as ‘most plainly appears from this Instance, ‘then ’tis impertinent to urge the Apostle’s ‘Example, as having the force of an express ‘Command. — As if the Dr. should have said, If all Scripture-Examples do not oblige, then none do: And tho’ an Example may not be looked upon with that force as an express Command; yet we will accept of Gospel-Example for *Infants-baptism*, would the Dr. be so kind as give it us: But we must not urge him, lest he counts us unreasonable.

But after the Dr. hath spent two Pages, in tossing about the business of the *Sabbath*, or *First-day* being Commanded, with many
Flou-

the matter of Fact is justly Questionable; those Reports are supposed by the most Impartial, to be raised by malicious *Papists*; who spake as bad things of *Calvin* and *Luther*, and the *Waldenses* before them, which Slanders were received by some inveterate Protestants, as Mr. *Ross* and his Brother *Edwards* in his *Gangrena*, in their abominable *Forgeries*, two fresh to be forgotten. But were this true, I would fain know how this affects the Doctors dissenting Parishoners, or any in his Parish. Now observe how disingeniously the Dr. insinuates; he frames a Parishoner to Answer '*We are now better inlightned, as appears from our Confession of Faith, &c.* O then he appears in a Rapture of Joy, as tho' he had gained some *Olympick Prize*! 'I am glad (*saieth he*) you are so much reformed, as to Renounce those *Munster-Delusions*.

Reply. And when the Doctor's passion of Joy is a little over, I shall ask him a Question or two: First, Sir, Do you not know that the Church of *Christ*, at *Corinth*, had imbraced some wild Doctrines, as dispensing with Incest, and denying the Resurrection of the Dead? Would it, I Pray, have been proper,

per, and ingenious, for the Pastor of the Ch.
at *Jerusalem*, to acquaint his Flock, that he is
glad they have laid aside or renounced the
Corinth-delusions? Which indeed they had
never owned or imbraced. Secondly, But
Sir, if I may be so bold, I would attempt
a little to check your great Confidence:
I have been informed, that many of the Ch.
of *Engl.* have lately not only been Accused,
but justly Condemned and Executed as
Traitors against His Sacred Majesty and
the Government: Is it so, or not? It's
too Notorious to be denied. But ought
this to be Returned, or Charged upon the
Pædo-Baptists in the Parish of *Beckenham*?
Surely, No; that is not fair. And besides,
they were taught in the late Reign of K. *J.*
that *Loyalty was the best Religion*; tho' I can-
not find this amongst the Dr's Catalogue of
Books: — *But every thing* (saith Wise So-
lomon) *is beautiful in it's time.* — But I sup-
pose, it might have been as much Wisdom in
the Dr. to have spared his *Munster-Story*;
for he may know we can give them *Argu-
mentum Adhominum*, Twenty for One, it
need be: and these Arguments of our Dr.
will hardly be Convincing.

To proceed, the Dr. spends several Pages to Ballance Accounts with us : and to shew that there is no need of Gospel-proof for Infant-baptism, because there is none for taking an Oath, and putting the *Hand* on the *Book* ; which is a Legal or Politick practice amongst Men, for ending of Strife, but is no part of Gospel-worship. So that it seems if there be no Gospel Law, or Command for Swearing, and *handling the Book*, there needs none for the great Ordinances of the Gospel: Strange Divinity ! p. 23. ‘ But, saith the Dr. ‘ if you could prove this Civil and Legal ‘ Swearing ; yet, pray, where are you Com- ‘ manded to lay your *Hand on the Book*, and ‘ *kiss the Book* : Now he tells us we may ‘ well be Silent.

Reply. I could Wish there were no occasion for Testimonial, or for Promiscary Oaths ; which were men more faithful to each other, there would not, but I would fain know what all this tends to the Proof of *Infants-Baptism* ; which is the Dr’s Business. What ! because we may promise Fidelity to each other, and may witness to Truth, in matters of Controversie, if barely from human Authority in Civil matters, not Gospel-worship, then we may Baptise
our

our Infants, or rather *Rantize* them from that Authority. I take this to be our Dr's way of *Reasoning*: and if in our civil Customs we put our Hands on the Book and Kiss it, then we may Christen *Infants* with Gossips, and the Sign of the *Cross*. Then if a *Lord-Mayor* may be impowred by Civil Authority, *ergo*, So may a *Lord-Bishop*: Then Sir, I will grant your Infant-baptism is a humane Custom, and that is, I think, as much as you contend for.

Next, the Dr. requires an expresse Command for giving the *Communion* to Women, p. 26. when he knows 1 Cor. 11. 28. the *Greek* expresseeth it not *Consequentially*, but *let*, or *I require*; and not *I*, but the *Lord* also, that a *Man* or a *Woman* do examin themselves, and so eat, &c. it being in the common Gender. Let the Dr. give us a *Greek* Text that saith, *Let a Minister baptise an Infant*, and we'll be satisfied, and baptise our Infants: But there is none. But p. 29. The Dr. tells us, there is no Command for it; and I shall here mention what the Learned Dr. Owen a *Pædobaptist* saith, in his Answer to Parker, in p. 345. he calls such trifling stuff, as our Dr. urgeth, a *Captitious, Sophistical Tale*, by which ten thousand things may be made lawful.

[22]

And a little further he saith, *That everything esteemed as part of Divine Worship, that is not Commanded, is Forbidden.* So that I fairly conclude, That if Infant-baptism be esteemed part of Divine Worship, it is Forbidden; because the Dr. p. 29. and *Pedo-baptists* do frequently grant there is no Command in Scripture for it : And then, let *Pedo-baptists* consider, *Jer. 32. 25. Deut. 18. 20.* And yet, p. 33. 'The Dr. doubts not our *Conviction*, if we will lay aside our *Ignorance* and *Prejudice*, -- and he earnestly begs us 'to lay them aside by all means, and then he 'promises to endeavour to *Convince* us, not 'by unwarrantable *Suppositions*, but by natural and necessary *Consequences* from the 'Scriptures, that it is not only *Lawful*, but 'also our *Duty* to baptise our *Infants*. — 'And because he designs to be as *Brief* as 'possible, he will only insist on this one 'Argument.

Well Sir, we assure you we have no *Prejudice* against your Person, or *Gospel-Truths*. You are pleased to grant in your *Preface*, p. 7. that we have been kind and loving *Parishoners*, — and whereas you fear our *Ignorance*, I assure you, if we are so, it is not voluntary ; and I do hereby *Promise* you, to
recede

recede from either *Prejudices* or *Ignorance*, when discovered, and shall be thankful to you for such *Convictions*; --- for I grant *The Priest's lips should keep Knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his Mouth.* Mal. 2. 7. 8. But if it appears they are departed out of the way, we shall chuse rather to take St. *Chrysostom's* Counsel; --- *Not to regard what this or that Man saith, but enquire all things of the Scripture.* Hom. 13. 2 Cor: ---

The Dr. lays down his Argument thus framed, 'All those who ought to be admitted visible Church-Members, ordinarily ought to be Baptised.

'But some Infants ought to be admitted visible Church-Members; therefore some Infants ordinarily ought to be Baptised.

And the Dr. that he may remove our *Ignorance*, declares, 'That this Argument doth consist of two *Premises*, and a *Conclusion*; and the reason is, because all Hypothetical *Sylogisms*, have just so many parts, -- except they be *Lame*. So that is all one as if he had declared to the World, *That his Horse had got four Legs, however it came about.*

Well Sir, the *Major* is freely granted: for we all agree, that *Baptism* is the *initiating*

Ordinance into the Gospel-Church : and it was undoubtedly the *Door of Admission*, and *Enterance* into the Visible Church ; and that the right of *Member-ship* comes in by *Baptism*.

But, p. 35. The Dr. saith, ' He shall conclude this Particular with an Argument ' of Mr. *Baxter's*, thus framed ; " If there be " neither *Precept*, nor *Example* of admitting " Church-Members in all the *New-Testament* " but by *Baptism*, then all that are now admitted, ought to come in by *Baptism* : But " there is neither *Precept* nor *Example* of admitting Church-members in all the *New-Testament* but by *Baptism*, therefore they " ought to come in the same way now.

Reply. I do not a little wonder the Dr. should spend two or three Pages to prove a *major*, which no body denies except a *Quaker* ; and when all is done, it doth his Cause no Kindness at all, the *minor* being positively deny'd, if he means visible Church members of a Church of Christ. p. 36. I shall confute his *minor* by this Argument : If there be neither *Precept*, nor *Example* in all the *New-Testament*, for admitting *Infants* to Church-member-ship by *Baptism*, then they ought not to be so admitted now ; but there is neither *Precept* nor *Example* in all

all the New-Testament, for admitting *Infants* to Church-member-ship by *Baptism*; therefore they ought not to be so admitted now.

None can deny the *major*, except a *Papist*, as a *popish Priest* confest to a Minister of the *Baptised Way*: Saith he, *There is indeed no Scripture for Baptising of Infants, but yet it ought to be done, because the Church hath Commanded it.* This was a true, and ingenious Confession.

And my *minor*, That there is no such Precept nor Example for *Infant's* admission by *Baptism*, as the Dr. hath not assigned either: So it is the ingenious, and almost general Confession of *Pedo-baptists*, that there is neither Precept nor Example to be assigned in Scripture for it; but that the Scripture is totally Silent as to any such a Practice.

And since the Dr. hath given us One of Mr. *Baxter's* Arguments to prove his *major*, I shall return him Two of them to Confute his *minor*:

I. Mr. *Baxter* saith, *If there can be no Example given in Scripture of any one that was Baptised without the profession of Saving Faith, nor any Precept for so doing, then must not we*
Baptise

Baptise any without it : But the Antecedent is true, therefore so is the Consequence.

I ask the Dr. whether he can Challenge this Argument of Mr. Baxter's to be inconcludent of Truth? And if not, it expressly Confutes his Cause.

2. Again: *If it be the appointed use of all Christian-Baptism, to solemnize our Marriage with Christ; or to seal and confirm our Union with him, then must we baptise none that profess not Justifying Faith : But the Antecedent and Consequent are both evident : Gal. 3. 26, 27, 28, 29. Thus Mr. Baxter.*

To which the Testimony of Dr. Hammond agrees, *That all Men were instructed in the Fundamentals of Faith antiently before they were permitted to be baptised.* So that Pado-baptists are evidently Self-condemned in this their practice. But to proceed:

Pag. 37. 'We being such an ignorant
'People, the Dr. Questions whether we understand the Terms of his *Proposition*, and
'do rightly apprehend what it is to be admitted a visible Church-member. And to
'Answer his Demand, he sets up a nameless Parishoner, which he makes to speak as he would have him, thus; '*He that knows what it is to be a Member of a Family, a Corpora-*
'tion,

'tion, or any other Society; he who enjoys the
'Priviledges and Franchises of any Corporation,
'such a Person is properly a Member, &c. And
'then the Dr. supposeth we will grant, that
'he who hath a *right* and *title* to the Bless-
'ings and Promises of the Gospel, such a
'Person ought to be acknowledged as a
'Member of that Spiritual Society we call
'a Church. Then he mentions Mr. Oliff's
'Defence of *Infants-baptism*, who jumps in
a judgment with him, and his strange Fit
of Dictating. And in p. 39. He saith, I
'hope you Competently understand it: it's
'answered by his Parishoner; I think I do.

Though for my part, as wise and under-
standing a Person as our Dr. is, I question
whether he doth so understand it as to re-
concile what he hath said with it self, so as
to consist with his Practice: For,

First, The Members of a Family have
right to the Provision of the *House*, as *Meat*
and *Drink*, &c. can freely go to the *Table*,
and partake thereof: But *Infants*, when
they are made *Members* of that the Dr. calls
a *Church*, they must neither *Eat* nor *Drink*
at the *Table*. So that from hence here is a
fair *Inference* against his Practice he con-
tends for.

Secondly,

[20]

Secondly, He that is admitted a Member of a Corporation, takes his freedom by virtue of a Legal Charter, Ratified and Confirmed by the Sovereign's Power : But there is no Legal Charter by a Divine Law to admit Infants Members of a Gospel-Society, as hath been already shewed ; there is no Clause for it in the great Charter of the Gospel.

But to proceed, p. 39, 40. The D. saith,
' If no Infants ought to be admitted visible
' Church-members, then the reason must be
' either,

' First, Because Infants are not capable of
' being admitted visible Church-members ;
' Or else,

' Secondly, Because it is no Benefit or
' Advantage to Infants so to be admitted,
' Or else,

' Thirdly, Because Christ the great Law-
' giver to the Gospel-Church, hath declared
' he will not admit them. This is the *ma-*
ior of his Argument : His *affirmative* is,
' That none of these Particulars can be *af-*
firmed. His *conclusion* is, Therefore some
' Infants ought to be admitted visible
' Church-members.

Reply.

Reply. And first I deny your *major*, or the consequence of your *major*, whether you please to call it : For I say there is another great Reason why *Infants* are not to be admitted Church-members by *Baptism*, and that because there is no Command nor Example for it, as hath been fully shewed before : There is no Precept nor President for it in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus.

1. I Deny that Infants are capable of being admitted visible Church-members of a Gospel-Church of Christ.

2. I Deny that it's any Benefit or Advantage to Infants, as such, to be admitted Church-members.

3. I say, That Christ the great Law-giver to the Gospel-Church hath not declared he will not admit of the Infants of *Jews*, *Turks*, or *Pagans*. — I demand whether our Dr. would therefore baptise them ? I suppose he would not : Yet our Lord hath not said, *Ye shall not*.

Dr. p. 41. Demands, 'Whether we can pretend that *Infants* are not capable to be admitted visible Church-members.

Reply. They are not capable in their Infant state.

Dr.

Dr. 'I pray answer me this short Question, *Were not Infants Members of the Jewish Church?*

Reply. That Children were Members of the *Jewish Church* is granted: And what then?

Dr. 'Why, *Then are they not likewise capable to be admitted Members of the Christian Church?*

Reply. No by no means: Because by reason of the tenderness of Age, they cannot Repent nor Believe; which are the antecedent Qualifications: Not as the Dr. wou'd perswade us, *p.45.* That Service and Obedience vowed and promised on man's part, *will* serve turn; but there *must* be visible & actual Faith, and Repentance, or there is no admission to Gospel-Church-membership: And moreover, it is evident, *that without Faith, it's impossible to please God, in any Gospel-Service.* But behold! none of these Qualifications of Repentance, Faith, Self-Examination, Self-denial, &c. was required of persons, to qualify them for that Fleshly Rite of *Circumcision*: And this in short may sufficiently confute his Consequence, *That because Infants were Members of the Jewish Church, and were capable of having Carnal-Ordinances,*

dinances imposed on them, therefore they are capable of Gospel-Church-membership, and to partake of Spiritual Ordinance without the least degree of Spiritual Understanding.

But p. 44. 45, 46. The Dr. is pleased to enter into a strange Fit of Dictating, he saith, 'Did we either consider the nature of Church-membership, or the different Capacities of Church-members, we would not talk at this confident rate. p. 45. He saith, 'he must remind us, that there are two sorts of Church-members under the Gospel, as well as under the Law. And in the same Page he saith, It must be granted by him, that there are several conditions of Church-membership, wholly inconsistent with this Infant state.

Reply. Sir, I thought I had discussed this point before, and had made it appear that we are not so Ignorant of the true notion of Church-membership as you suppose; for according to your 19th Article, *We believe the visible Church of Christ to be a Congregation of faithful Men; in the common Gender, Men and Women; in the which the pure Word of GOD is Preached; and the Sacraments duly administred according to Christ's Ordinance in all those things that*

that are requisite, and necessary to Salvation. So that, Sir, I believe a Gospel-Church-member to be a *Faithful* Man or Woman, that hath put on Christ by *Baptism*, and walks according to that Sacred Profession, in Holiness and Newness of Life.

Pag. 46. 47. The Dr. saith, 'There are Primarily, and Principal Church-members, adult Persons, Men and Women, that are capable to receive the *Word* gladly, *Acts*, 2. Such as the *Samaritans*, and the *Eunuch*, *Acts*, 8. and the *Jaylor*, *Acts*, 16. That they did first *Believe*, *Repent*, and then by *Baptism*, were admitted Church-members. Such Passages as these are only to be applied to the Adult Persons, Men and Women, of Capacity and Understanding, but cannot in the least concern Infants. Thus far the Doctor.

Reply. And these are all that either your 19th Article mentions, or the New-Testament; a *Church* is a Congregation of *Faithful* Men, &c. and I am sure there are no other degrees of Church-members spoke of in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus: Now how he makes up his two Sorts, p. 45. or two Species, p. 50. of *Church-members*,

I know no other Sorts, or species, but Believing Men, and believing Women : Here is two Sects.

But p. 46. the *Dr.* saith, There are a more imperfect sort of Church-members ; such are Infants, as also Adult persons, that are born Deaf, and Dumb, and are incapable of Instructions ; all these are only passive Church-members.

Reply. The *Dr.* might have multiplyed his Sorts and Sizes of Church-members ; as the illegitimate Bastards, and natural Idiots, born Fools, void of Reason ; which are all Baptised-members on their accounts : For all is *Fish* as comes to the *Net* : But I would fain know, What way the *Dr.* will take to make us believe what he saith is true ? Hath he no demonstrations but his bare *Ipsedixits* ? or only our Ignorance, or Prejudice that obstructs our receiving it on his bare Word ? But *Sine Authoritate Scripturarum Garrulitas non habet fidem.* — Without the Authority of the Scripture prattleing gains no Credit. We deny that Infants are in any sense capable of Gospel-church-membership.

p. 47. The *Dr.* saith, Those Texts, that speak of Repentance and Faith, to qualifie for Baptism, are to be applyed to the Adult, not to Infants, that are not capable of them : But, saith he, such mis-application is a grand Fundamental mistake of your Party, and for Conviction, he must desire us to consider, that the meaning of such indefinite Expressions is to be judged of from the Nature and Capacity of those Persons, to whom they are spoken : It's an Apostolical Command, saith the *Dr.* that if any Man would not Work, Neither should he Eat. 2 *Thes.* 3. 10.

Reply. Here the *Dr.* saith well, That all those Texts that speak of Faith and Repentance, to

D

qualifie

qualific for Baptism, are only applicable to the *Adult* : It's very true, Sir, and so are all the Texts that speak of Baptism and Church-membership ; So that there is neither Repentance, Faith, nor Baptism, required of Infants, Fools Bastards, Deaf &c. in the Gospel of our Lord Jesus. But to return what the *Dr.* charges, on himself, I fear it's not a mistake, but a wilful Error in the Pedobaptists ; in supporting their mere humane Tradition by the mis-application of those Sacred Oracles. And Alas ! when Men have strained their Wits, and Racked their Brains to draw Consequences from Scriptures for Infants Baptism ; they are no more Natural than for a *Papist* to argue thus, *Mat.* 16. 19. Christ gave *Peter* the *Keys* of the Kingdom of Heaven ; therefore the *Pope* may sell as many Pardons for Money, and Damn and Save as many Souls as he pleases, being *Peter's* Successor.

But, to proceed, p. 48. the *Dr.* supposes that some Brain-lick *Enthusiast* should thus argue from *2 Thes.* 3. 10. Infants cannot Work, therefore they must not Eat, Old, Impotent, and Bed-ridden Persons cannot Work, therefore they must Starve. This doth only forbid the relief of Idle Lubbers and Lazy Drones, who can Work, but will not ; but it doth not prohibit relief of Children, or such Weak and Aged as cannot Work. ---- Now, saith the *Dr.* you have answered your self, and saith he, in like manner it is apparent that Faith, Repentance, and Obedience, are only required of Adult Persons who are able to perform them : Not Infants, who are not capable of them.

Reply. I think that the *Dr.* hath in a few words answered all his own Pretences, and given away his Cause ; for, Behold there is nothing more evident

vident than that Baptism is a work of Obedience; an active Subjecting to the Command. I shall by this one Argument, return upon the *Dr.* the proper Conclusion from his Concession.

If Infants are not capable of Obedience, then Infants ought not to be Baptised; but the *Dr.* saith, Infants are not capable of Obedience; therefore Infants ought not to be Baptised.

For as it's great Weakness to suppose that Text, *He that would not work, shall not Eat*, to intend or include infants: So it is as great weakness to suppose any other Gospel-Text that mentions Church-member-ship or Baptism, should intend or include Infants: Thus have I shewed that Infants are not capable of Church-member-ship or Baptism.

2. I proceed to examine what the Priviledges are the *Dr.* talks of, that will redown to Infants, by their Church-member-ship.

1. I have already shewed they have no Fellowship or right of Communion at the Lord's-Table; they enjoy no more Priviledges in the Church, while Infants, after, than before: So that here is no Advantage to them; upon this account.

The *Dr.* p. 60, 61. As to what he mentions of being taken into God's house, and Family, I have briefly answered before.

1. I deny that Infants have Pardon of Sin by their pretended Baptism: Not of *Actual* Sin, for they have committed none, and such as have pardon of Sin have it upon their Repentance, which Children cannot do. And sure he doth not mean *Original* Sin; for they are under that, equally after, as before their Baptism; tho' this was assigned as the use of it, when it was first decreed in the Councils aforesaid; yet of late most *Pedobaptists* have learned to be wiser than so.

And as for Infants eternal inheritance in the Next Life, it's not on that Score, no Conditions being required for Infants Salvation ; they having never Acted Sin, are by our Saviour pronounced Heirs of the Kingdom of Heaven ; as the *Dr.* grants p. 71. And Our Gracious God hath not put the eternal State of Infants into the Hands of Vain Man.

The *Dr.* spends no less than the Substance of many Pages about the order of Words, in *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark*, 16. 16. One had need be as Grave as a Judge, that can forbear smiling ; to observe the *Dr.*'s frivolous Evasions : Because the Order of Words is not to be looked upon in some Texts, therefore in none ; *Ezek.* 14. 14. *Daniel* is named before *Job* ; *Mark*, 1. 4. *John* preached the Baptism of Repentance, &c. Observe, 1. Baptised, and then preached the Baptism of Repentance. *Gal.* 5. 22. Joy and Peace are mentioned before Faith, &c. *Mark*, 4. 5. Take notice, first you have his Baptising, and then their Confession. —

Reply. Doth the *Dr.* suppose they were Infants that went out to him ? Or, doth he suppose he Baptised those that went out before his Preaching, or their Confession ? He dare not say it : But I shall briefly Dispatch this : the *Dr.* knows the *Pronoun* [*them*] that is put after the [*Participle*] *Baptise* ; can possibly have no other *Substantive*, than those persons that were first capable of teaching ; In the Parrallel Text, *Mark*, 16. 16. Now, If Infants are not excluded in *Mathew*, they being part of the Nations, then there is no Creature excluded from Baptism in *Mark* 16. 16 because, the Gospel is to be preached to every Creature ; Then by this kind of Logick ; Birds and Beasts, as well

well as Babes maybe baptised; for they are Creatures, if he saith they are not *Subjctum Capis*, I say neither are Infants : And would it not be improper to say an Infant may be Christened before it's Born naturally ; so it is to imagine that Christ, or his Apostles, did admit any to Gospel-baptism before they were spiritually born by Faith and Repentance.

P. 86. The Dr. supposes, ' That if this Commission were given to several Divines of the Church of *England*, to go and Disciple the *Indians*, would they not first Preach the Gospel ? And when the Adult had imbraced it, would they not have Baptised them ? And when this were done, can any imagine that these Missioners would refuse their Infants ? —

And the Argument the Dr. useth to perswade us to Believe they would then Baptise their Infants, is ;

' Seeing it is in use amongst us here in *England*, from whence the Commission came, &c.

Reply. Sir, what they would do, I know not ; but I have some reason to believe the Divines of your Church would be too like the Veins of your Steeples ; and would before all things prefer their own Interest and Safety ; as hath been too evident in former Revolutions.

2. I do not suppose they would refuse to Baptise their Infants ; for why may they not serve for Members of a Carnal National Church in *India*, as well as *England* : But were the Apostle's of Christ, or their Successors in the same Faith, to go, they would refuse to Baptise their Infants ; and say, *We have no such Custom, nor the Churches of Christ.*

And then in p. 81. He saith, ' That if the Commission had run, *Go, Proselyte all Nations Circum-*
cising

cising them? he appeals to us whether the Infants
of such *Gentiles Profelites*, should be excluded Cir-
cumcision.

Reply. Take this short Answer; We do believe
all Females, Women and Infants, would not be
Included, and so Excluded, because they had not
those Natural Parts to qualify them for it. So I
also Believe all Infants are excluded Baptism, be-
cause they have not those Spiritual parts to qualify
them for it—And let this serve for an Answer;
for the Women, and Female Infants, are a part of
the Nations also.

And as for the Dr's Arguing, that because some In-
fants were capable of Circumcision, is Frivolous; for
doth it follow that because it was the Will of the
great Legillator to give a positive Command that
the Male-Infants should be Circumcised on the *eighth*
day precisely, upon a severe Penalty, that vain Man
without any Command, must Baptise Male and Fe-
male Infants, on the 1st, 3d, or 7th day; when it's e-
vident, *Abrams* Natural Seed had no right to Baptism:
Nor have any, but such as do the works of *Abram*.
Because the Fruit-trees were holy. *Lev. 19. 23. 24.* Cir-
cumcised, and in Covenant, therefore we must baptise
ours in *England* and take them into Churchmembership.
And now tho' the Dr. hath indeavoured to rub the
Rust of this Old and Forlorn Argument, that hath
been as oft Confuted as Started, as he cannot be
Ignorant of, even by Learned pens. Now there is
not a word in the Gospel to institute Infant-baptism,
as hath been asserted, neither Precept nor Example,
as hath been both Expressly and Tacitly granted.
And then it is safe to be Sober, and not to advance
above Gospel-Rule for Gospel-Worship: as tho' we
must be sent to School to the Old Ceremonial
Law, that is vanished, *Hebr. 8.* to learn Gospel-Or-
dinances

dinances, as tho' Christ our great Prophet, who is come, had not by Positive, or (to use our Doctor's Phrase) Express Commands and Example, established his Ordinances, without the Retrogression to Moses; and assimilating them to the *Padigogy* and Similitude of Types, &c. And to end the Dr's Plea from hence, and Confute this Consequence I shall give the Reader one Instance or two out of some Eminent *Padobaptists* Writings.

First, The Lord *Brooks*, in his Treatise of *Episcopacy*, p. 100. saith thus; " That the Analogy which *Baptism* now hath with *Circumcision*, in the Old Law, is a fine rational Argument to illustrate a Point well Proved before. But I somewhat doubt, saith he, whether it be Proof enough for that which some would prove by it; since besides, the vast Difference in the Ordinances, the Persons to be Circumcised, are stated by a positive Law, so express that it leaves no place for Scruple; but it is far otherwise in *Baptism*, where all the Designations, for ought I know of Persons fit to be Partakers, is only such as Believe; for this is the qualification which with exactest search I find the Scriptures mentions Persons to be Baptised; and this it seems to require in all such Persons: Now, how Infants can properly be said to Believe I am not yet fully Resolved.

Thus far this Learned Gentleman Learnedly and Truly Argues against our Dr. Tho' he was a *Padobaptist*, sure he had not found out our Dr's Distinction about two Species, or Kinds of Church-members? He was more ingenious than to impose frivolous Nonsequiters upon the belief of his Reader.

Again, Dr. *Taylor*, lib. *Proph.* p. 228. Who saith, " The Argument from Circumcision is invaled upon Infinite Considerations, Figures and Types prove nothing

* nothing except a Command to go along with it :
“ Or some Example to signify such to be their Pur-
“ poses, &c.

So that I conclude safely, and take no more than
is given me from these two *Pedobaptist* Gentlemen,
That Infant-baptism cannot be concluded from *Cir-*
cumcision, without a Gospel-Command ; and our *Dr.*
hath granted that there is none : For it is unrea-
sonable to expect it.

And because as hath been said, there were no Qua-
lifications required to fit male Infants for *Circum-*
cision, the *Dr.* spends three or four Pages in quoting
Texts, that spoke of the adult *Israelites*, to *wash them*,
make them clean ; and *David's* praying for a *clean*
Heart, &c. and the *Jews* were admonished to take
away the fore-skin of their *Hearts*, &c. — A thin
Shrub for the *Dr.* to shroud under.

Then p. 35. The *Dr.* asks, *Whether an Infant of*
eight days old, could Circumcise the Heart.

Reply. No, it could not, neither was it required ;
nor could it have a broken Spirit. It was never
made the antecedent to *Circumcision*, preparatory
for it ; tho' it's absolutely necessary to be found^d in
all that are to be *Baptised*, p. 56. Tho' *Circumcision*
were good, and valed even to *Babes* and *Fruit-trees*,
yea, *Fools*, *deaf* and *dumb Babes* of *eight days old* :
Yet to *Sprinkle* an *Infant*, and call it *Baptism*, is a
mock *Baptism*, and sets the *Infant* on *Crying*, when
the right Subject goes away *Rejoycing*. For there
is this difference, That Law was a Yoke that we nor
our Fathers were able to bear, so tedious was the
Yoke of *Circumcision* : but shall we *Jewdise* the
Gospel, and make that so too, and make their Hearts
sad whom God hath not made sad : But I pass this
having already spoke of his pretended Priviledges that
Infants enjoy by their Church-membership, p. 36.
and

and shewed that after all his stir, they are just none at all.

The *Dr.* p. 63. 67. Here is a strange Consequence he would fain should help him out : He asks, *Whether Infants are not capable of Civil Adoption, and to be admitted into a College, or Hospital, &c.*

Reply. Yes ; they are : And what if they are capable of it? Doth it follow that then they may be Baptised? What weak Trifles are these from such a Parson !

In p. 67. The *Dr.* saith, ‘ He will explain it by considering civil affairs in the act of Naturalization of foreign Protestants ; the Parents only do take the Oaths, and Test ; for Infants know nothing of the matter, yet this Act of the Parents is imputed to the Children, for their Benefit, &c.

Reply. Well then, the Parents may Believe and be Baptised, and their Infants may enjoy all the Privileges they are capable of ; and yet know nothing of Baptism ; because as the Infant hath not Wisdom, nor cannot understand the Oaths and Test, so he is altogether as incapable of Baptism, which is a solemn Covenanting with God. And so let that pass.

P. 62. The *Dr.* saith ‘ If our Infants are not Christians, Jews, nor Turks, then they are Heathens ; and then the Apostles will admonish you that they are without Christ, without Hope, without God in the World, &c. *Ephes.* 2. 12. And p. 63. He tells us, That out of the Church there is no Salvation ; and what will you leave them to the general Mercy of God, like a Company of Heathens ?

Reply. Our *Dr.* was but now, in p. 48. Condemning us for mis-application of Scriptures, tho without the least just cause : But behold, he is grossly mis-applying two Texts ; doth *Ephes.* 2. 12. speak of Infants ? No, sure : did they walk according to the

Course of this World? Had they their Conversations in the *Lusts of the Flesh*, verse 2, 3,

Again, p. 63. He saith, Out of the Church there is no Salvation: and Cites *Acts 2. 47. And the Lord added to the Church, daily such as should be Saved*

Are *Infants* intended here? Surely the *Dr* dare not say it for Shame: Did *Peter* Preach to them, and Convert and Baptise them? surely no: verse 46. did *Infants* continue stedfast in the *Apostles Doctrine* and Fellowship in breaking Bread and Prayer, and it was such as these that were added to the Church. And, Sir, is there no Salvation out of your Church? I never heard a Protestant say so before: I know the *Papal Church* so concludes; then it's time for silly Women, that believe it, to be frightened if their *Infants* should dye before they are Sprinkled: and then it seems the general Mercy of God, without the particular Mercy of the *Priest*, *Infants* cannot be Saved. But I leave this to the Reader; and the *Dr's* second thoughts; and say, *Infants* are saved without Faith or Baptism, by the Merits of Christ.

p. 64. He is offering strange dictates, and would have us to believe, That *Infants* are Believers before they Believe, &c

p. 65. He saith, 'God doth estimate them as Believers:

Well Sir, and he estimates them as Baptised, without Baptism: And what then?

Again he tells us, that *Infants* are esteemed as Rational Creatures, and treated as such, not as Brutes.

Reply, I grant it; I shall frame an Argument from it to his hand thus; Those *Infants* that may be treated as Rational Creatures, not as Brutes, may be Baptised; But,

Infants

Infants of Turks and Jews may be treated as Rational Creatures, not as Brutes; ergo, Infants of Turks and Jews may be Baptised:

I suppose the Dr. on a second view, will not like the looks of his Assertion, or Inference.

What he cites out of the Book of Martyrs as Mr. Filpot's Words, does him no kindness; but makes against him as to the case in hand: If Infants cannot profess him, they cannot put him on by Baptism, --- And after a great deal of Circumlocution, and vain Reiterations, (3ly in p. 73.) he puts us to prove where Christ, the great Law-giver to the Gospel-Church hath said he will not admit them: And this he calls the very hinge of the Controversie. And here I shall mention the account the Reverend Doctor Stillingfleet gives of the plea of his Popish Adversary, in his discourse concerning the Idolatry of Rome. p. 177. "The Jesuit saith the Charge of Idolatry brought by the Dr. is groundless; because it's not declared in divine Truth; that honour is not to be given to Images of Christ, and his Saints, that what appears to be bread in the Eucharist, is not the Body of Christ; that it is not lawful to invoke Saints to Pray for us. These are the Jesuit's words requiring the Dr. to prove these negatives, on which single point he puts the stress of his argument. Just so doth our Dr: But, saith the Dr. now Bishop of Worcester, the point is so easy it will not require much time to dispatch it, for I assert it to be an Article of my Faith, that God alone is to be Worshiped with Divine and Religious Worship; and he that cannot infer that no created being is to be Worshiped, hath the name of a reasonable Creature given him to no purpose: What need we make

"Negative

Negative Articles of Faith; that the Pope is not
" Tradition is not; Councils are not; a private
" Spirit is not: For all these things are necessarily
" implied therein. We do therefore Refuse the
" Belief of them, because not contained in the only
" Rule of Faith the Bible.

NOW, Sir, take the same Answer; Believer's Baptism is contained plainly in the Scriptures, the only Rule of our Faith; therefore lest we should have the Name of Rational Creatures given us to no purpose, we can infer, that neither Bells, nor Eaves, are Subjects of Baptism; and thus Sir, your main hinge as you call it p. 73. is by your own Dr. quite thrown off the Hook; and all your pressing us to assign a Prohibition as you do to p. 77. doth but Symbolize you with the Jesuit, your now Bishops Antagonist: But to conclude, the Dr grants p. 99. that the Doctrine of the Gospel was not Calculated for Infants: Then I am sure, the Doctrine of Baptism was not, which is one great Doctrine of the Gospel.

I shall conclude with these two Arguments.

1 Argum. The New Testament doth plainly and sufficiently declare unto us, who are the proper and capable Subjects of Baptism. But the New Testament doth not plainly and sufficiently declare that Infants are the proper and capable subjects of Baptism: Therefore Infants are not the proper and capable Subjects of Baptism.

1 AU 59

2 Argum. If Infant-baptism were an Ordinance of Christ, then the Scriptures would somewhere declare, how, when, or where Christ ordained it: but the Scriptures no where declare how, when or where Christ ordained it; ergo, Infants-baptism is no Ordinance of Christ:

F I N I S.

